

WATER QUALITY M E M O R A N D U M

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

April 26, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Hydrologist III

RE: 2003 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Savage Industries, Inc., Savage Coal Terminal, C/007/0022-WQ03-4, Task ID #1820

- 1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?** YES [x] NO []
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

The MRP was modified in 2002 to indicate water monitoring will be conducted in the 2nd and 4th quarters to avoid any confusion concerning sampling frequency. The one sample collected (CV-1-W) was collected on October 2, 2003.

- 2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year re-sampling of baseline water data.**
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Re-sampling due date Not Required

- 3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?** YES [x] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

In the 2nd quarter monitoring, Specific Conductivity for site CV-1-W was reported as >20,000 mohms. This is unacceptable. The Operator needs to get a meter that reads values greater than 20,000 mohms or needs to dilute the sample to get a more accurate reading. The Operator has been notified of this.

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES [x] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring sites:

The Specific Conductivity at site CV-1-W was reported at approximately 10% of the anticipated value (1460 mohms). The TDS value (9537 mg/l) and SO4 values (6839 mg/l) were within the anticipated range and make the Sp. Cond value highly questionable. The Operator was contacted but the issue was not resolved.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

Identify sites and months not monitored:

1st month, YES [x] NO []

2nd month, YES [x] NO []

3rd month, YES [x] NO []

DMR information has been submitted electronically. September 2003 information was missing, but the Operator has submitted the information during the quarter.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [x] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring sites:

CV-15-W recorded 'No Discharge.'

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [] NO [x]

Comments, including identity of monitoring sites:

CV-15-W recorded 'No Discharge.'

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No further action is necessary for the 2003 4th Quarter Water Monitoring data.